

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

December 2, 2008 Advisory Action

Applicants are in receipt of an Advisory Action dated December 2, 2008. In the Remarks Section on page 2 of the Action, the Examiner states that Applicants have mischaracterized the reference and mentions that the circuit board (40) is outside of "this region". Applicants note that the statements made by the Office are erroneous.

Applicants have not mischaracterized the reference in that the bracket for quick installation and removal of the light emitting structure through the aperture to and from the bay includes a support structure carrying the light emitting structure. The support structure of the bracket has a frame for supporting the linear light source and a circuit mount having two portions for supporting the power control circuit. This limitation, that the bracket has a frame for supporting the circuit mount, is not met by the reference as will be discussed herein and should be given patentable weight.

Examiner's Interview regarding IDS dated September 16, 2008

In the Final Action, the Office failed to initial the references in the form 1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement dated September 16, 2008. Applicants believed that this was an oversight on the part of the Office and that these references have been considered. Applicants telephoned the Examiner and respectfully thank the Office for providing the initialed form 1449 document on or about December 16, 2008 indicating that the references were considered.

Allowable Subject Matter of independent Claim 10

In the Action, Applicants express appreciation to the Office of the indication that Claim 10 includes allowable subject matter, if placed in independent form. Applicants respectfully amend Claim 10 to place Claim 10 in independent form. Allowance of independent Claim 10 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Action, Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-15 and 18-20 are rejected as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 7,095,457 to Chou (hereinafter “Chou”). Applicants respectfully disagree with the instant rejection because Chou does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 1.

Claim 1 recites that the backlight unit has a chassis and a bracket. Claim 1 also recites that the bracket has a support structure that carries the light emitting structure. As further recited in Claim 1, the support structure has a frame for supporting the linear light source and a circuit mount with two portions for supporting the power control circuit.

Chou does not disclose or suggest that the bracket has a support structure that carries the light emitting structure and that the support structure has a frame for supporting the linear light source and a circuit mount with two portions for supporting the power control circuit.

Chou discloses a detachable rack (30) having a number of illumination units (31) that fits into a guiding groove (11) of a casing (10). A circuit board (40) is in the casing (10) and is not supported by the detachable rack (30). Therefore, Chou does not disclose or suggest that the bracket has a support structure that carries the light

emitting structure and that the support structure has a frame for supporting the linear light source and a circuit mount with two portions for supporting the power control circuit.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is erroneous. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 15 is also patentable as Chou does not disclose or suggest “a bracket for quick installation and removal of the light emitting structure through the aperture to and from the bay, having a frame for supporting the linear light source and a circuit mount having two portions for supporting the power control circuit”.

Independent Claim 20 is also similarly patentable as Chou does not disclose or suggest “providing a bracket for quick installation and removal of the light emitting structure through the aperture to and from the bay, including a frame for supporting the linear light source and a circuit mount having two portions for supporting the power control circuit”.

Dependent Claims 3, 4, 7-9 and 11-14 are patentable as these claims depend from independent Claim 1. Dependent Claims 16-19 are patentable as these claim depend from independent Claim 15.

Rejection of Claims 5-6, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Action, Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chou in view of United States Patent No. 6,445,373 to Yamamoto (hereinafter “Yamamoto”). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection of Claim 5 and traverse the rejection as follows. Applicants submit that the combination of Chou and Yamamoto do not disclose or suggest Claim 5, 6, 16 and 17.

Yamamoto discloses a number of light emitting diodes supported in a frame, which can be slid out of a side of the housing and replaced. Yamamoto does not

remedy the deficiencies of Chou as discussed above and discloses that the circuit board 58 and set circuit boards 59 are separate from the rack 42 shown in FIG. 3 and at Col 6, lines 38-42. Yamamoto discloses that the circuit boards are connected to a bracket 60, which are connected to housing element 25 in FIG. 3, and not the slidable rack 42. One would not alter the teaching as hypothetically suggested by the Examiner. Therefore Claim 5 is patentable as it depends from independent Claim 1.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chou in view of Yamamoto in view of United States Patent No. 6,545,732 to Nakano (“hereinafter “Nakano”). Nakano discloses using a rubber mount as a support structure for a lamp. Yamamoto nor Nakano remedy the deficiencies of Chou as discussed above.

In the Action, Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chou in view of United States Patent No. 7,150,557 to Chen (hereinafter “Chen”). Chou, Chen and the combination thereof fail to disclose or suggest that the bracket has a support structure that carries the light emitting structure and that the support structure has a frame for supporting the linear light source and a circuit mount with two portions for supporting the power control circuit.

Chen discloses a backlight module arrangement shown in FIG. 3 and 4 that includes an inverter 56, which is disposed outside of the frame 52, and not as claimed. Chen does not remedy the deficiencies of Chou as discussed above. Therefore, Claims 16 and 17 are patentable.

In light of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of, and withdrawal of the rejections and an allowance of the instant patent application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jean-Paul Cass". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "P" and "C".

Jean-Paul Cass

Registration No. 46,605

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
JPC/PJE:dk